

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 18, 20, 21, 30 and 32-36 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 18, 20, 21 and 30 are amended, claims 32-36 are added, and claims 2-4, 6-17, 22-29 and 31 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims and the drawings. Withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 2-4, 6-18 and 20-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,978,046 to Shintani (hereinafter "Shintani") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,027 to Jeong (hereinafter "Jeong"), U.S. Patent No. 5,434,626 to Hayashi et al. (hereinafter "Hayashi") and U.S. Patent No. 7,206,029 to Cohen-Solal (hereinafter "Cohen-Solal"). Claims 2-4, 6-17, 22-29 and 31 have been cancelled. The rejection, in so far as it applies to claims 18, 20, 21 and 30, is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 18 is directed to a video display appliance, including a display screen, a processor that generates a display signal which is output to the display screen, wherein the display signal causes the display screen to show a main picture and a sub-picture that is superimposed on the main picture, a key input unit coupled to the processor, wherein a user can manipulate buttons on the key input unit to instruct the processor to take certain actions, and an on-screen display (OSD) generator, coupled to the processor, which causes the processor to generate a sub-picture OSD adjustment menu, wherein the sub-picture OSD adjustment menu

Amdt. dated September 15, 2009

Reply to Office Action of June 19, 2009

includes a function control display section and a level adjustment display section, wherein the level adjustment display section displays at least two arrows, each of the two arrows being oriented in one of a left, right, upward or downward direction, and wherein the user can manipulate the at least two arrows displayed by the level adjustment display section to select options on the sub-picture OSD adjustment menu to change characteristics of the sub-picture, wherein the processor displays an amount of change in a selected characteristic of the sub-picture.

Shintani neither discloses nor suggests all of the features recited in independent claim 18, or the claimed combination of features.

Shintani discloses a television that displays one or more sub-screens 37 and one or more corresponding captions 35 on a main screen 36. Shintani neither discloses nor suggests a processor that displays a sub-picture OSD adjustment menu including a function control section and a level adjustment display second, nor that such a level adjustment display section displays at least two arrows each oriented in a left, right, upward or downward direction, nor that any of the characteristics of the sub-screens 37 may be altered, let alone that such characteristics of the sub-screens 37 may be altered through manipulation of the arrows of such a sub-picture OSD adjustment menu. Thus, Shintani neither discloses nor suggests a processor as specifically recited in independent claim 18.

Further, Jeong fails to overcome the deficiencies of Shintani. Jeong discloses an OSD implementing device including a key input section 11, a control section 12, an OSD generating

section 13, and a video input section 16. Figures 3A-3E of Jeong illustrate how an OSD menu for volume control is generated and displayed by these elements. Jeong's disclosure is focused only on the generation and display of an OSD menu. Jeong makes no disclosure whatsoever as to the application of such an OSD menu to the adjustment of a sub-picture and/or any of its characteristics, nor that any such OSD menu is actually a sub-picture OSD adjustment menu including a function control section and a level adjustment display second, not that such a level adjustment display section displays at least two arrows each oriented in a left, right, upward or downward direction, as recited in independent claim 18. Rather, Jeong's system is focused on displaying a degree of change as a histogram or a moving bar. Thus, Jeong fails to overcome the above described deficiencies of Shintani.

Hayashi is merely cited as allegedly teaching superimposing a sub-image on a main screen, and thus fails to overcome the deficiencies of Shintani, either alone or in combination with Jeong.

Cohen-Solal is merely cited as allegedly teaching the setting of first and second locations by a user, and for at least this reason fails to overcome the deficiencies of Shintani, either alone or in combination with Jeong and/or Hayashi. Further, in the Cohen-Solal system 100, a PIP image 210A is automatically and continuously repositioned as necessary with respect to an underlying primary image 210B when a processor 120 determines that the PIP image 210A is obscuring the primary image 210B. Cohen-Solal neither discloses nor suggests displaying any type of sub-picture OSD adjustment menu, let alone a sub-picture OSD adjustment menu as

Serial No. **10/772,337**

Docket No. **IPS-0017**

Amdt. dated **September 15, 2009**

Reply to Office Action of **June 19, 2009**

specifically recited in independent claim 18. Thus, for this additional reason, Cohen-Solal fails to overcome the deficiencies of Shintani, either alone or in combination with Jeong and/or Hayashi.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 18 is allowable over the applied combination, and thus the rejection of independent claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shintani, Jeong, Hayashi and Cohen-Solal should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 20, 21 and 30 are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 18, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

II. New Claims 32-36

New claims 32-36 are added to the application. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 32-36 meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 18, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, **Joanna K. Mason**, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. **10/772,337**

Docket No. **IPS-0017**

Amdt. dated **September 15, 2009**

Reply to Office Action of **June 19, 2009**

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Carol L. Druzick
Registration No. 40,287
Joanna K. Mason
Registration No. 56,408

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 CLD:JKM:ihd

Date: September 15, 2009

\\Fk4\Documents\2025\2025-018\201514.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610